

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHALAMON DUKE,  
Plaintiff,

v.

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-06327-PJH

**ORDER DIRECTING PARTIES TO  
REFILE PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 50

The court is in receipt of the parties' "Stipulated Protective Order." Dkt. 50. Sections 9(b)–(c) of the Northern District of California's Model Protective Order for Standard Litigation ("Model Order") allow a non-party certain protections concerning its confidential and contractually-protected information that is in the possession of a party and subject to production in an action. Additionally, section 12.3 regarding "Filing Protected Material" provides instructions regarding filing protected material under seal. The proposed order does not include those sections and, based on the court's review, provides no substitute in their place.

The court **DENIES** the parties' proposed order (Dkt. 50) and **ORDERS** that the parties refile<sup>1</sup> a proposed order that, at a minimum, includes materially similar language to sections 9(b)–(c) and 12.3 of the Model Order, available on the court's website under

<sup>1</sup> Additionally, the court notes that Civil Local Rule 5-1(i) requires the filer of any document to attest that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from each of the other signatories. The filer's attestation may be incorporated into the document itself or take the form of a declaration attached to the document. Any future joint filings, including the refile of this protective order, should include either an attestation or declaration as required by Civil Local Rule 5-1(i).

1 “Forms”—“Model Protective Orders.”

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated: August 24, 2020

4 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

5 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
6 United States District Judge  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

United States District Court  
Northern District of California